



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

position. With him the new type of loving life came to stay, though occurring sporadically before. He stands at the glorious point in history where the line of spiritual life, before somewhat flickering, becomes sure and continuous. To recognize this of him is to admit the sentimental, illustrative, and symbolic use of his name. To demand anything more in his behalf is to ask what cannot be justified at the bar of reason, while it serves as a disturbing element.

The article is a critique of the Christocentric theology from the standpoint of modern Unitarianism. The writer has certainly pointed out some serious flaws in the new system. But he asks too much of his opponents. To his charge that they are not able to state clearly the metaphysical side of their doctrine they may fairly retort: That may be due quite as much to the subjective conditions in their critic as to their own failure to grasp and present the matter. It is certain that his critique of the general doctrine of the Trinity to the effect that this doctrine does not furnish any helpful elements as to the personality of God is a misjudgment of the doctrine made by a very small fragment of those who have tried to think through the subject. The vast majority have recognized in it very great helpfulness.

MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE ONE FLOCK OF CHRIST. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS; *Reformed Quarterly Review*, July 1896.

In the interpretation of the story of the Good Shepherd, found in the gospel of John, his personal relation to the individuals of the flock is usually considered, but Dr. Briggs considers his relation to the flock as a whole.

Jesus predicts the union of Jew and Gentile under one Shepherd. It is his mission to effect this union. He sends his ministers to preach the gospel to the whole creation, and tells them that he will not come again until, through their preaching, all his sheep have been led into the one flock. This one flock, as a complete and perfect organism, is the goal of his redemptive work. But before the time of the accomplishment of his gracious purpose, it is not the mind of Jesus that his sheep should remain apart, scattered or organized in a great number of different flocks. There is one Shepherd for each of the sheep, and only one Shepherd for the whole body of the sheep. The only normal relation is one flock, one Shepherd.

But all Christians are not now gathered into one flock. The Roman Catholic church recognizes no other flock of Christ than that within its own fold. Protestants, to be sure, regard all who love Christ as members of the invisible church, but, since no visible church is

coëxtensive with Christianity, some of Christ's sheep are excluded from it, and by such exclusion are debarred from all the advantages derived from the organization. This failure of Christianity to realize the ideal of Jesus is a sin which should not be condoned; it is, in short, high treason to the church and to Christ.

1. It was not the design of Christ that his one flock should be divided by racial differences. Jew and Gentile were made one in him. But now Christianity is divided on racial lines. There are the Greek and Latin churches. The Copts, the Armenians, and the Syrians for the most part are disunited. The German race is essentially protestant. But all should recognize the legitimacy of various racial types in the common Christianity.

2. Christ did not intend that his one flock should be divided by national distinctions. The successors of the reformers committed the sin of dividing it by national lines. And these lines of demarcation are kept up even in the United States, where the Reformed are divided into Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed and French Reformed. The same state of things substantially exists among the Lutherans.

3. It is not the mind of Christ that his flock should be broken up by differences of social condition. In early Christianity, rich and poor, bond and free, were on the same footing in the church. In this respect the Roman Catholics have been faithful to Christ; but it has remained for American protestants to organize special denominations for freedmen (?) and to establish congregations on the principles of social clubs. Christ himself will at last separate the goats from the sheep, but neither he nor his apostles ever separated the sheep from one another.

4. It was not the design of Christ that his flock should be divided by differences of doctrine. Pharisees and Sadducees in Jesus' day radically differed in doctrine, yet worshiped in the same temple. Paul contended with Barnabas and with Peter and James, yet did not break the unity of the church. Jewish and Gentile Christians remained in the one church, though the church at Corinth was torn by contending factions. But the compulsory subscription of creeds has divided Christendom into many denominations. While, however, these different denominations may rightfully contend for their theories in the forum of scholarship, he who by his theory divides the flock of Christ is guilty of *lèse-majesté*.

5. Differences in forms of worship should not divide the one flock. Each congregation should have absolute liberty as to forms of worship, and differences in ritual should not become walls of separation between different bodies of believers.

6. It is not the mind of Christ that his flock should be divided by differences in church government. Church government is not divinely ordered, and British Christianity has committed the great sin of dividing the flock of Christ by questions of polity. There is good in each of the various polities, but each has unfolded its own peculiar form at the expense of certain advantages contained in the others.

In order to unite into one flock the various folds, we must agree on the essentials. A definition of the essentials of the church may be regarded as the formal principle of church unity. But we shall never make this definition unless we are compelled by the irresistible force of a material principle. Love is that force.

Dr. Briggs thinks that if we were ready to give up everything not essential, all Christians might be brought into unity on the ground of the historical episcopate.

We have not space for extended criticism, but we notice :

1. That Dr. Briggs perhaps unwittingly exaggerates the divisions of the one flock. It is true that evangelical protestants are divided into many denominations, but these denominations are united in doctrine on ninety-five points in a hundred, and are able now to discuss without bitterness the points on which they disagree. They are also heartily coöperating in building up the kingdom of God. A large degree of unity is already secured.

2. The Greek and Latin churches are not divided on racial lines. The Greek church is the state church of Russia. Russia contains more than a hundred nationalities, that speak more than forty languages. Three-fourths of its population are Slavs. The line separating the Greek and Latin churches is both national and ecclesiastical rather than racial.

3. National churches exist on account of the union of church and state. They are separated politically, but in the main are united both in doctrine and spirit. Moreover, there are, in all parts of the world, hosts of independent churches, like those in apostolic times, which cannot be separated either by racial or national lines.

4. When Dr. Briggs says that Christ would not have the one flock divided by differences of doctrine, what does he mean by doctrine? If theories concerning doctrine, we heartily agree with him; but if the central, saving doctrines themselves, we must positively dissent. Christ certainly taught that it does make a difference as to what a man's doctrine is.

5. While Professor Briggs denies that there is a divinely ordered church government, he admits that the "general principles of church government were known and practiced by the apostles." Why not adhere to them and so secure unity in polity?

6. Why should not the work of becoming one visible organism begin somewhere? No wise man can reasonably expect all the divisions of the visible church to be wiped out at one time. The change toward unity must come gradually. First of all let those who differ least unite. For example, let the Presbyterians and the Dutch Reformed churches come together. One such object lesson would do more to hasten the desired end than a thousand learned essays.

7. But when the longed-for unity does come, we doubt if it will be through any adjustments of the various existing creeds and polities, through the "historical episcopate," or "quadrilateral," but it will come rather through a new baptism in the spirit of Christ. Then, without any extraneous appliances, non-essentials will disappear. Men, eager to know the divine will, will ask for the word of God. That word, not man-made creeds, nor propositions from any class of ecclesiastics, will be the basis of unity. Men will hear the Shepherd's voice and *follow* him. Then, and not till then, will Christ's prayer be fully answered that his children "may all be one."

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.